

DDA 76-0162

14 JAN 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

STATINTL

SUBJECT :

Don:

STATINTL

1. We wish to express our appreciation to the Inspector General Staff for the handling of the STATINTL and cases. Because there were many complexities to these two cases, I believe we were wise to hit upon the informal participation of the Inspector General before going to a straight and official confrontation between the employees and management. The approach which your staff members took in providing a forum for easy dialogue went a long way towards retaining the employment of these two fine officers. It is our understanding that Miss has STATINTL agreed to an assignment in the and STATINTL Mr. will go to

STATINTL

STATINTL

2. The Director of Security and our Career Service are grateful for your part in reaching this amicable solution.

/s/ John F. Blake

John F. Blake
Deputy Director
for
Administration

Distribution:

Orig 4 1 - IG

1 - D/Security

1 - DDA Subject (w/ background)

STATINTL

1 - DDA Subject (w/ background)

1 - DDA Chrono (DO NOT CIRCULATE)

1 - JNM Chrono

1 - JFB Chrono

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/05/02 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500160027-0

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/05/02 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500160027-0

1-1-1-1-1-1-1

1-1-1-1-1-1-1
FM Personnel-17

DDA 75-5427

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

STATINTL SUBJECT :

STATINTL 1. Mr. met with me on 13 November 1975 at his request. He indicated that he wanted to talk to me regarding the decision to terminate him from the Agency and wanted to discuss his case with me.

2. He carried with him a packet of papers reflecting his request for reconsideration of separation. I advised him that I had already read the documents and was thoroughly familiar with his case.

3. During the course of our conversation, while some points were amplified or put into slightly different connotation from what appears on the record, there was no basic input altering the facts at hand. He indicated that he did not want to go to and did not now even consider a separation assignment there even though earlier he had discussed this point. I don't believe that I persuaded him to take the assignment and he indicated upon conclusion of our conversation that he intends to appeal the decision.

4. He was worried that if the Director did uphold his position whether or not he would have a viable career afterwards. I assured him that it behooves all employees to obey the Director's decision, make sure it works, and that there would certainly be no animosity fostered or tolerated.

1-1-1-1-1-1-1
John N. McMahon
Associate Deputy Director
for
Administration

Distribution:

STATINTL Orig & 1 - D/Personnel (w/Subject OPF and Case File)

1 - D/Security

1 - Mr.

1 - DDA Subject w/background

1 - JNM Chrono

ADDA:JNMcMahon:kmg (14 Nov 75)

DDA Rec'd by
File Personnel-17

12 NOV 1975

STATINTL MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. [redacted]

SUBJECT : Recommendation of Your Termination to the Director

In accordance with subparagraph [redacted] I STATINTL
hereby inform you that I am recommending to the Director of Central Intelligence that he terminate your employment by this Agency. Also in accordance with that subparagraph, I inform you that you may file a written appeal from this recommendation with the Director within ten days of the date of this memorandum.

(SAC) F. W. M. Janney

F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

Distribution:

Original - Addressee
X - DDA
1 - OS
1 - D/Pers
1 - OPF

75 - 2405

personnel-17

STATINTL MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. [redacted]
SUBJECT : Notification of Consideration of your Separation

STATINTL I have received from the head of your career service a recommendation under HR [redacted] that you be separated from the Agency. In accordance with subparagraph [redacted] of that regulation, I therefore confirm to you that you are being considered for separation and I extend to you an opportunity to submit to me a written statement, or to comment orally, within ten days of the date of this memorandum.

STATINTL

F. W. M. Janney
F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

Distribution:

Original - Addressee
1 - DDA
1 - OS
1 - D/Pers
1 - OPF

File personnel-17

23 JAN 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

SUBJECT : IG Investigations of the [redacted] STATINTL
and [redacted] STATINTL

REFERENCE : Memo fr IG dtd 9 Jan 76, same subject

STATINTL

1. It appears that both the [redacted] and the [redacted] STATINTL cases have been resolved in a manner satisfactory to both the employees and the Office of Security.

STATINTL

As you probably are aware, both [redacted] STATINTL

STATINTL

[redacted] after individual conversations with me, agreed to accept assignments in [redacted] I wish to express my appreciation for your role in providing the forum within which the differences between the Office and these two young officers could be resolved.

2. While I have no desire to continue the dialogue in a case which has been satisfactorily resolved, I do believe however that it is necessary for me to respond to reference in view of the inaccuracies which it contains. I believe it would be unfair to some of the individuals mentioned in reference if the memorandum was permitted to become a record copy of this problem without some explanation of the other side. My comments are keyed to the paragraphs of reference.

STATINTL

3. I should like to note that in my conversations with [redacted] and in their conversations with other representatives of the Office of Security, it was made very clear that both these young officers could contact any representative of the Office at any time they might desire to work out a solution to the problem. In

STATINTL

effect, our approach to [redacted] has been an approach of reconciliation. Both of these officers knew that the Office of Security had no concerns over their performance, but there was concern about their stated unwillingness to accept assignment in [redacted] In summary, the door of my office and that of other senior

OS 6 0285

STATINTL

members of the Office of Security was always open to [STATINTL] I recognize, however, that they did not take advantage of this open invitation until the Inspector General representative again made this offer to them.

STATINTL

4. Paragraph 3 of your memorandum indicates that neither of these officers flatly refused assignment to [STATINTL] This statement is not supported by the facts in the case. Both officers stated that they would not accept an assignment outside the Washington, D. C. area in the investigative area. With reference to [STATINTL] she was offered an assignment in any [STATINTL] of her choosing that had a vacancy which could accommodate her. This offer was made not only by Office of Security officials but also by the Director of Personnel.

5. In commenting on paragraph 5, subparagraph (f), I should like the record to show that flexibility has always been an important ingredient in the Office of Security and is so reflected in Office of Security Directive No. 74-11 dated 14 May 1974, subject: Office of Security Criteria for Professional Employees; and in Office of Security Directive No. 75-7 dated 2 April 1975, subject: Office of Security Competitive Evaluation Criteria. Therefore, I think that it is improper to characterize Mr. Kane's attitude on this subject as "seeing red." I believe a more accurate view of his attitude on this subject would be a concern in the same manner as he would have a concern for performance. In addition, I believe the documentation on the [STATINTL] case makes it very clear that performance, not flexibility, was always the principle issue of concern.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

6. In paragraph 5 (i) the implication is clear that [STATINTL] and [STATINTL] were mutually exclusive in terms of Office policy. This is not so. [STATINTL] need for generalist training is a case easily made. [STATINTL] role to add youth to [STATINTL] is equally simple to justify.

[STATINTL] Office since his EOD with the Office of Security in 1966. He was reassigned to Headquarters in September 1975. His ICAP (Individual Career Advancement Program form) in 1973 and his

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

Assignment Preference Form provided in mid-1974, indicated interest in reassignment to pursue a generalist career in the Office. However, it is with paragraph 5 (j) that I take issue in particular. That subparagraph indicates an allegation that Mr. [redacted] was chosen because Mr. Kane considered him a smart aleck. As I mentioned to both Inspector General representatives who were working on this case, Mr. Kane had no part in the selection of Mr. [redacted] for his assignment to [redacted]. This decision was made without consulting Mr. Kane and his role in the selection was that of approval.

7. In commenting on paragraph 7 (a), the point should be made, it seems to me, that the supervisors referred to at [redacted] are the very same people who are making allegations in paragraph 5. It is probably true that Headquarters had all too little visibility of what the supervisors were telling their people about career management matters. That such utterances were out of phase with the real policy comes as no great surprise. Actions have been taken to insure that the management of the [redacted] is more conversant with general Office of Security policy.

8. With reference to paragraph 7 (c), I believe that this paragraph is in conflict with itself. Both [redacted] and [redacted] had full opportunity to express their assignment preferences. The fact that they did an incomplete job should hardly be blamed on the Office of Security. Both had an opportunity to identify personal, family, or medical problems which may have effectively curbed their flexibility to accept assignments [redacted] overseas. On many occasions, after the new assignments were surfaced to [redacted] [redacted] they had many opportunities to discuss any real problems with accepting the assignments. As is well known, neither [redacted] surfaced any reason for not accepting the assignments except to say that they did not believe they would be in their best career interests.

9. The above comments are made in the hope that a more accurate portrayal of these cases may become a matter of record. It is my opinion that reference paints both individuals as flexible but misunderstood victims. This patently was not the case. These two officers persistently reacted

to the proposals of reassignment by reflecting negatively without providing the Office of Security with any concrete indications of what their objections were. The failure of reference to address this self-serving frame of reference is perhaps its most serious fault.

10. There is no doubt that communications can be improved and action has been initiated with a view toward improving communications not only between Headquarters and the field offices but between supervisors and those being supervised at every level. I certainly accept whatever responsibility belongs to the Office of Security for the events which led to this problem involving [redacted] ~~STATINTL~~ [redacted] I believe there are some lessons to be learned from this incident and hopefully both the Office and the two individuals involved will profit in some way from this experience.

11. Again, I would like to acknowledge my appreciation for the efforts of the Inspector General in this matter.

STATINTL

STATINTL

Robert W. Gambino
Director of Security

cc: DD/A

UNCLASSIFIED INTERNAL CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/05/02 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500160027-0

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

IG Investigations of the
and Cases

STATINTL

STATINTL

FROM:

Robert W. Gambino
Director of Security

EXTENSION

NO.

DD/A 76-0-225

6777

22 JAN 1976

DATE

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and
building)

DATE

OFFICER'S
INITIALSCOMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom
to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

22 JAN 1976

B

2.

22 JAN 1976

S

3.

Registry file

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.